EXPLANATION OF

06

فروع الفقه

Ibn Al-Mibrad

Shaykh Ahmad Musā Jibrīl

May Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) ease the affairs of the Shaykh, preserve him, love him, and safeguard him from all harm. May He (سبحانه و تعالى) keep him sincere, and continue to shower his life and da'wah with His blessings, and allow the Muslims to benefit from his da'wah until the Day of Judgement. May Allah make all his efforts weigh heavy on his scales, and make it an immense Sadaqah Jāriyah for him, his parents, and his family. May Allah facilitate the completion of this Sharh, and shower him with His aid always and forever.

SH_AHMAD_JIBRIL

SHAYKH_AHMAD_JIBRIL

T.ME/AHMAD_MUSA_JIBRIL

SHAYKH AHMAD MUSĀ JIBRĪL

SHAYKH AHMAD MUSĀ JIBRĪL

بسم الله الرحمان الرحيم

الحمد الله المحمود على كلِّ حال، ونعوذ بالله مِن حال أهل الضلال، وأشهد أن لا إلٰه الا الله وحده لا شريك له الكبير المتعال، وأشهد أن سيدنا و نبينا محمداً عبده و رسوله، صلى الله عليه و على آله و صحبه و التابعين و من تبعهم بإحسانٍ إلى يوم المآلِ، أما بعد

All praise is due to Allāh, the One who is praised in all circumstances. And we seek refuge in Allāh from the state of the people of misguidance, and I testify that there is no god but Allāh Alone, who has no partner, the Great, the Most High. And I testify that our lord and Prophet Muhammad is His slave and Messenger, may the peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him, and upon his family, his companions, their successors and whoever follows them with sincerity in striving for perfection until the Day of Judgement. As for what follows:

We're still teaching Furū Al-Fiqh, and we're on the statement in the book pertaining to Tahārah where the author said:

* وَأَمَّا **الطَّهَارة** .. فهي **صُغْرَى**؛ وهي الوُضُوء يحتوي عَلَى **سُنَّةٍ**؛ وَهُو التَّسميَةُ.

The purification is the minor ritual Wudū' purification.

He mentioned purification is minor, which means there's a major purification. Minor is what requires Wudū'. And it's referred to as minor because it requires some body parts. Major is what requires Ghusl, and it's referred to as major because it pertains to washing the entire body. The author is talking about Sunan Al-Wudū':

وهي الوُضُوء يحتوي عَلَى **سُنَّةٍ**؛ وَهُو التَّسميَةُ.

He said *'Wudū' consists of recommended (Sunnah) acts.'*

The first one that we're going to go over is mentioning Allāh's (سبحانه و تعالى) name prior to Wudū'. Here, the author divided matters pertaining to Wudū' into Sunnah and

Wājib. He began with the Sunan. Sunnah, according to the Fuqahā', is what one is rewarded for doing – at the same time he's not sinned if he refrains from performing it.

He divided matters pertaining to Wudū' into Sunan and Wājibāt - obligations and recommended acts. Unlike the author here, most of the latter 'Ulamā' of the Hanābilah divided Wudū' into three categories:

- Sunnan
- Furūd
- & Wājibat

The author only said there's two categories, Sunan and Wājibat. The reason the author's division is different is because he considered Tasmiyyah (saying Bismi-Allāh) before Wudū' a Sunnah. So one of the sections wasn't need, whether it may be Wājib or Fard. The latter Fuqahā' of the Hanābilah divided matters into Sunnan, Wājibat, and Furūd. Why? Because they don't consider Basmalah a Sunnah. They consider it an ordainment (a Wājib). They believe it's obligatory to say Bismi-Allāh prior to Wudū'. But they don't consider it at the level of a Fard, so they placed it under the category of Wājib – which is an act that is compulsory, but slightly less than a Fard. The latter Fuqahā' of the Hanābilah categorized Basmalah prior to Wudū' as a Wājib instead of a Fard, and with that they would have Sunan, Wājibat, and Furūd.

Our first Mas'alah, is saying Bismi-Allāh prior to Wudū' Wājib or Sunnah? The first opinion is that it's Wājib – you must say Bismi-Allāh before Wudū'. And that's the opinion of Ad-Dhāhiriyyah, Al-Hasan Al-Basri, and Ishāq ibn Ar-Rahway. And it's one of two opinions of Imām Ahmad, and it's the official opinion of the Madhhab of Al-Hanābilah. It's:

المعتمد في المذهب

The official opinion of the Madhhab.

Saying Bismi-Allāh prior to Wudū' is a Wājib – a must. The latter 'Ulamā' of the Hanābilah consider Tasmiyyah prior to Wudū' Wājib. And this is the opinion chosen of Abu Bakr Al-Khalāl for the Madhhab. And since we're studying the book on the

Madhhab of Imām Ahmad, at times we pass by essential figures who served the Madhhab that are not really popular. It's important to know them just like we mentioned Muwaffaq Ad-Dīn Ibn Qudāmah (رحمه الله تعالى). Here, Abu Bakr Al-Khalāl is really the man behind structuring the Madhhab of Imām Ahmad (رحمهم الله تعالى جميعاً).

He was a child when Imām Ahmad died, because he died around 241 years after the Hijrah. Abu Bakr Al-Khalāl was born 235 years after the Hijrah. So when Imām Ahmad died, Abu Bakr Al-Khalāl was about six or seven years old. He grew up and was amongst Talabatul-'Ilm – more specifically he dwelled into studying the works of Imām Ahmad. He traveled to Persia, Syria, Al-Jazīrah Al-'Arabiyyah, and nearly every person and every place he could reach where he heard they may have any type of knowledge pertaining to Imām Ahmad whether it may be a fatwā, letter, or anything else.

Al-Imām Adh-Dhahabī (رحمه الله تعالى) said, there was no independent Madhhab of Imām Ahmad prior to Abu Bakr Al-Khalāl's compilation of the work of Imām Ahmad. And he compiled a reference called: *Al-Jāmi' li 'Ulūm Al-Imām Ahmad*. Al-Jāmi' became the encyclopedia and reference of the Madhhab of the Hanābilah with no competition. Ibn Al-Qayyim said it's twenty volumes long. Ibn Kathīr said there was no book on the Madhhab of the Hanābilah like Al-Jāmi' li 'Ulūm Al-Imām Ahmad, but that book does not exist today. Most likely it was among the literature and books that was destroyed by the Tatār when they invaded Baghdād, which is where the author is from.

Some 'Ulamā' like Al-Khiraqī summarized that reference book, and that summary is available today. Abu Bakr Al-Khalāl and his book, Al-Jāmi' li 'Ulūm Al-Imām Ahmad goes to show what I mentioned in the past many times. A student, or students are usually the ones who revive and make the works of their Shuyūkh successful.

Back to our issue here, saying Basmalah before Wudū'. The first opinion we mentioned was Wājib (an obligation). And that's one of two opinions by Imām Ahmad (رحمه الله تعالى), and the official opinion of the Madhhab. Their proof is:

لا وضوء لمن لم يذكر اسم الله عليه

The Wudū' of a person who does not mention the name of Allāh (سبحانه و تعالى) in the beginning, is not a valid Wudū'.

This supposed Hadīth has been narrated by nine of the Sahābah. Sa'īd Ibn Zayd, Sahl, 'Āisha, 'Ali, and Anas (رضي الله تعالى عنهم جميعا). Some like Al-Mundhir, Ash-Shawkāni, and Ibn As-Salāh authenticated that Hadīth – their opinion being there is numerous narrations, despite their weakness they strengthen each other, thus making it authentic. This is really not the correct opinion because the Hadīth is very weak.

The second opinion on Basmalah is that Tasmiyyah prior to Wudū' is Sunnah. First opinion was Wājib, this is Sunnah. This is the opinion of the Hanafiyyah, Mālikiyyah, Shāfi'īyyah, and the second opinion of the Hanābilah. The author of this book chose that as his opinion – and we know it by his statement:

وهي الوُضُوء يحتوي عَلَى **سُنَّةٍ**؛ وَهُو التَّسميَةُ.

What's their proof? Their proof is the ayah in the Qur'ān that describes Wudū':

يا أَيُّهَا الَّذينَ آمَنوا إِذا قُمتُم إِلَى الصَّلاةِ فَاغسِلوا وُجوهَكُم وَأَيدِيَكُم إِلَى المَرافِقِ وَامسَحوا بِرُءوسِكُم وَأَرجُلَكُم إِلَى الكَعبَينِ

O you who believe! When you intend to offer As-Salāt, wash your faces and your hands (forearms) up to the elbows, rub (by passing wet hands over) your heads, and (wash) your feet up to ankles. (5:6)

The verse describing Wudū' in the Qur'ān did not mention Tasmiyyah, so it's not a Fard nor Wājib. Their second rationale is there are many Sahābah who narrated the details of the Wudū' of Rasūlul-Allāh (صلى الله عليه و سلم) – and they did not mention the Tasmiyyah.

Like the Hadīth by 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Amr Ibn Al-'Ās, and 'Abdullāh Ibn Zayd. They said, if it was Wājib they would have narrated from the description of the Wudū' of Rasūlul-Allāh (صلى الله عليه و سلم) that he said Bismi-Allāh in it, and none of the narrations

did. The third rationale is, most agree that the Hadīth is not authentic. Assume this Hadīth is authentic:

لا وضوء لمن لم يذكر اسم الله عليه

The Wudū' of a person who does not mention the name of Allāh (سبحانه و تعالى) in the beginning is not a valid Wudū'.

They said, even if it is authentic, it does not necessitate it being Wājib. It merely means the Wudū' is not complete Wudū' in its reward, not that it voids or nullifies the Wudū' completely. Because there are other Ahādīth that narrate the description of the Wudū' of Rasūlul-Allāh (صلى الله عليه و سلم) without mentioning the Tasmiyyah. And they said this Hadīth is like the Hadīth:

لا يؤمن أحدكم حتى يحب لأخيه ما يحب لنفسه

You will not believe until you love for your brother what you love for yourself.

Does that mean somebody who doesn't love for his brother what he loves for himself is a kāfir? This is not considering that person a kāfir, it merely denies complete, full Ēmān to one who doesn't love for his brother what he loves for himself.

In Al-Majmū' and Al-Mughni they said it means the Wudū' is diminished in reward, not void – that is IF that Hadīth is even authentic.

Ar-Rājih (the selected opinion) is that At-Tasmiyyah would be a Sunnah, not a Wājib. And the proof of it being a Sunnah is general proof – not specific proof pertaining to Wudū'. Because the Hadīth is very weak, rather it's proof outside the context of Wudū' that makes Tasmiyyah prior to Wudū' a Mustahab.

Like what we mentioned in Tayyamum, the Hadīth in Sahīh Bukhāri:

لو أن أحدكم إذا أتى أهله قال: بسم الله، اللهم جنبنا الشيطان وجنب الشيطان ما رزقتنا،

If anyone intends to have (sexual intercourse) with his wife, he should say: "Bismi-Allāh! Allāhumma janibnash-Shaitana, wa jannibish-Shaitana ma razaqtana (In the Name of

Allāh, O Allāh! Keep us away from Satan and keep Satan away from what You have bestowed upon us);'

If Basmalah is recommended prior to something like sexual relations with a wife, then it should be recommended for matters like Wudū' as well. In fact, Al-Bukhāri placed that Hadīth under the chapter "بَابُ التَّسْمِيَةِ عَلَى كُلِّ حَالٍ وَعِنْدَ الْوِقَاعِ", he named the chapter *"Saying Bismi-Allāh during every action, and prior to sexual relations with one's wife."*

Therefore Tasmiyyah is Sunnah in numerous matters – both in 'Ibadāt and non-'Ibadāt. Like eating, drinking, entering the house, leaving the house, sexual relations, and other matters. So they said, prior to Wudū' it should be included as well, a Sunnah.

An important note here to mention, is that the Hadīth regarding the invalidity of one's Wudū' without the mention of Allāh's name, it's in Abu Dawūd, Ibn Mājah, Al-Bayhaqi, At-Tabarāni, Al-Hākim, Ahmad, Ad-Dāraqutnī, and other books of Hadīth. The Hadīth is considered weak by Imām Ahmad, Al-Bayhaqi, An-Nawawi, Al-Bazār, and many other 'Ulamā' of Hadīth. In fact Al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajar said that Imām Ahmad had said (which he mentioned in Bulūgh Al-Marām),

لا يثبت فيه شيء

لا يصح في هذا الباب شيء

Ibn Qudāmah in Al-Mughni said that Imām Ahmad had said about this Hadīth,

ليس يثبت في هذا حديث ولا أعلم فيها حديثٌ له إسناد

These statements by Imām Ahmad all indicate he strongly states (in meaning) there is nothing authentic and specific pertaining to saying Bismi-Allāh prior to Wudū'. There's no authentic Hadīth regarding this matter, specifically.

The conclusion is the Hadīth is extremely weak, every chain of its numerous chains is weak. However, this Hadīth was used by the Hanābilah for this matter, so does that discredit them? Here I want to make two comments for Tulāb Al-'Ilm.

Some like to toss around the term that there's nothing authentic in this matter, they make a nice banner, post it, and let it go. It could be factual, and many times it is. But they do so with no explanation or elaboration and at times when they are asked, it's left with no comment. That causes concern because you need to speak to people on a level they understand. Due to their lack of upbringing, 'Ilm, and wisdom in it, along with the ignorant followers they have – they cause slander to 'Ulamā' who are above the level of the Shuyūkh of their Shuyūkh. How? When they see, 'There's nothing authentic on their Basmalah,' (and this has actually happened) for example, an issue (it wasn't Basmalah it was a different issue), no elaboration or explanation, and when asked there was no concern in answering. It's concerning to an ignorant audience that has no foundational study. They'll see someone else mentioning Tasmiyyah before Wudū' and considering it Sunnah, and they'll accuse that person, inferring that they accept/promote weak Ahādīth. They'll say that person is not a Muhadīth, or bolster and say, 'No, they don't know about the rules of the Mutaqadimīn.' That lowkey slander may even be directed to the likes of Imām Ahmad (رحمه الله تعالى). And that audience ends up accusing others of promoting weak Ahādīth, which is a dangerous accusation. For example, they fail to explain to their audience that there's other ways 'Ulamā' may have concluded that this matter is a Sunnah or Wājib. The matter of Basmalah prior to Wudū' is a prime example.

They infer that it could be a Sunnah prior to Wudū', using Qiyās of saying Basmalah prior to sexual relations, eating and drinking, or entering the house. That may not be needed for Talabatil-'Ilm who knows this. But their ignorant, slandering audience should be aware of these matters. Yes it can be, 'There's nothing authentic under this matter,' but there's other ways 'Ulamā' may arrive at the conclusion that Basmalah is a Sunnah in Wudū', for example.

Another issue pertaining to this, Imām Ahmad clearly stated with the clearest terms, that this Hadīth on saying Bismi-Allāh before Wudū' is weak – using strong terms on this. Yet his entire Madhhab is split between considering it a Wājib or mustahab,

many even using this Hadīth itself. How does Imām Ahmad, or the Madhhab, use a Hadīth they say is weak? Is that a deficiency in Imām Ahlus-Sunnah, Imām Al-Hadīth, who memorized over a million Hadīth – and when we say he memorized a million Hadīth we mean (some people say there isn't even a million Hadīth) if there is a Hadīth with ten chains on that same Hadīth that's considered ten Ahādīth. Included with that Hadīth they also considered narrations of the Sahābah and Tabi'īn to be included under that.

How does Imām of Ahlus-Sunnah and Hadīth, who memorizes a million Ahādīth, and compiled in his book alone, Musnad Ahmad, forty thousand Ahādīth, promote weak Ahādīth? And he uses them for Fiqh? There's a Fiqh and Usūl aspect to this within the Madhhab that they outline. In "حاشية ابن مفلح على المحرر" Ibn Muflih mentioned an Usūl rule within the Hanbali Madhhab. And that's accepted by the Hanābilah and allegedly attributed to Imām Ahmad Ibn Hanbal himself. It states (in meaning), if a Hadīth says to refrain from something with a weak chain (but not extremely weak), then that order deterring one from something, that would be considered harām in usual circumstances in such context, will be diverted into being disliked instead of harām due to the Hadīth being weak.

In general, Usūl rules, an order deterring from something with nothing to divert it, no additional proof to divert it – would be considered harām. They said, due to the Hadīth being weak, we'll consider it disliked rather than harām. They also said if the Hadīth is weak and not extremely weak, and it orders you to do something, that would on normal circumstances be an obligation (if there is nothing to divert it from being a Wājib), we'll defer it to being a mustahab (recommended act) or a mandūb, due to the Hadīth being weak.

One needs to be careful in how they take things, and how they loosely accuse others of not having knowledge, or Mutaqadimīn principles, or not being a Muhadith, or using weak Ahādīth. They need to watch what they're saying.

Now going back to the author's next statement:

* وَأَمَّا **الطَّهَارة** .. فهي **صُغْرَى**؛ وهي الوُضُوء يحتوي عَلَى **سُنَّةٍ**؛ وَهُو التَّسميَةُ. وَغَسْلُ اليَدَين قَبْلَه ثَلاثًا.

The next Sunnah of Wudū' is washing the hands three times. It's actually two Sunnan, washing the hands is one, and doing it three times is another. Washing the hands prior to Wudū' – up to Al-Rusgh (الرسغ).

Ibn Mandhūr in Lisān Al-'Arab said, الرسغ is the joint connecting the hand with the forearm (*he points to the wrist*). Some 'Ulamā' consider washing the hands (which is not a dispute) a Sunnah for Wudū', as part of Wudū' (that's the majority of the 'Ulamā'). Some consider washing the hands three times an independent Sunnah, not part of Wudū' – like Miswāk, it's Sunnah but not part of Wudū'. And that was some of the Shāfi'īyyah, they said washing the hands prior to Wudū' is a Sunnah but it's not part of the Wudū'. The overwhelming majority say no, it is part of the Wudū'. And the proof for washing the hands in Wudū' is a Sunnah, is in the verse:

يا أَيُّهَا الَّذينَ آمَنوا إِذا قُمتُم إِلَى الصَّلاةِ فَاغسِلوا وُجوهَكُم وَأَيدِيَكُم

In the verse pertaining to Wudū' Allāh (سبحانه و تعالى) did not mention the hands. Had it been Fard it would've been mentioned in the verse, that's what they said. And there's also many Ahādīth describing the Wudū' of the Messenger (صلى الله عليه و سلم) in detail. Hadīth 'Uthmān in As-Sahīhayn, Hadīth 'Abdullāh Ibn Zayd in As-Sahīhayn, Hadīth Ibn 'Abās in Sahīh Bukhāri, they mention the detail of the Messenger (صلى الله عليه و سلم) in one way or another making Wudū'. All those who mention it say the Messenger (صلى الله عليه و سلم) washed his hands before Wudū'. The Messenger's action combined with the verse not mentioning it, is Sunnah. Among the Ahādīth that mention the washing of the hands is what's in Sahīh Bukhāri on the authority of 'Abdullāh Ibn Zayd, that he was asked about the Wudū' of Rasūlul-Allāh (صلى الله عليه و سلم),

فدعا بتَور من ماء، فتوضَّأ لهم وُضُوء رسول الله –صلى الله عليه وسلم–، فأكفَأ على يديه من التَّورِ، فغسَل يديه ثلاثًا،

'Abdullāh Ibn Zayd was asked about the ablution of the Prophet. 'Abdullah bin Zaid asked for earthenware pot containing water and in front of them performed ablution like that of the Prophet (ﷺ). He poured water from the pot over his hand and washed his hands thrice.

Similar to that, there is a Hadīth by 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) in Sahīh Bukhāri and Muslim, 'Uthmān washed his hands three times then said,

رأيت رسول الله توضأَ نحو وضوئي هذا

After he washed his hands he said, "I saw the Messenger (صلى الله عليه و سلم) performing Wudū' like the Wudū' I just performed in front of you."

There's also 'Ijmā'. Ibn Al-Mundhir, and An-Nawawi said – everyone we know of from the people of knowledge made 'Ijmā' that washing the hands at the start of Wudū' is a Sunnah. Not being mentioned in the verse describing Wudū' shows it's not an obligation/Wājib. But then mentioning it in the Hadīth shows it's a Sunnah. Now if someone's hands are fully clean, he ate – washed his hands and sat down, and got up to make Wudū' again – he should still wash his hands as a Sunnah for Wudū'.

The next Mas'alah, a different issue, washing the hands after one wakes up. Why is this important? There is a strong Hadīth about it in Sahīh Bukhāri and Muslim, on the authority of Abu Hurayrah (رضي الله عنه),

إِذَا اِسْتَيْقَظَ أَحَدُكُمْ مِنْ نَوْمِهِ فَلَا يَغْمِسُ يَدَهُ فِي اَلْإِنَاءِ حَتَّى يَغْسِلَهَا ثَلَاثًا فَإِنَّهُ لَا يَدْرِي أَيْنَ بَاتَتْ يَدَهُ

"When one of you wakes up from his sleep, he must not put his hand in a utensil till he washed it three times, for he does not know where his hand was (while he slept)".

The 'Ulamā' differ on this. So when you wake up must you wash thrice or no? The first opinion is that it's an obligation on one to wash his hands three times when he wakes up from a night sleep (these terms are essential) that voids the Wudū'. It's one of two opinions by Imām Ahmad, and it's the opinion of Al-Madhhab Adh-Dhāhiri.

The second opinion is the overwhelming majority of the 'Ulamā', and among them is Abu Hanīfah, Ash-Shāfi'ī, Māliki, and the second opinion by Imām Ahmad. We know the principle of Usūl, (which I mentioned earlier) an order to do something would be Wājib. It's obligatory, unless there is a factor that drops it down to being a Sunnah. But why would the 'Ulamā' differ on washing the hands when one gets up from night sleep (in the Hadīth) to being a Sunnah? Even though there is a direct order? Why would some of the 'Ulamā' do it? They said, if someone is sure his hand didn't touch impurity, he does not have to wash his hands. He only washes if he sees impurity or knows there's impurity on it. The proof on it is in the Hadīth:

فَإِنَّهُ لَا يَدْرِي أَيْنَ بَاتَتْ يَدَهُ

For he does not know where his hand was while he slept.

This deters it from being a Wājib. They said that statement within the Hadīth shows the reason for washing, so it's not Wājib. It's only Sunnah unless one's hands has impurity on it. They also mention the other Hadīth to support that,

إِذَا اسْتَيْقَظَ أَحَدُكُمْ مِنْ مَنَامِهِ فَلْيَسْتَنْثِرْ ثَلاَثَ مَرَّاتٍ فَإِنَّ الشَّيْطَانَ يَبِيتُ عَلَى خَيَاشِيمِهِ

"When one of you wakes up from his sleep (and performs Wudū'), he must blow of his nose three times, for the Satan spends the night inside one's nostrils."

Some of the 'Ulamā' related an 'Ijmā' that one does not need to blow or clean his nose when he wakes up, except Ibn Hazm who considered it a Wājib. They said the same way, the order to clean the nose is not Wājib, the order to wash the hands is not Wājib as well because they're very similar and worded in a similar fashion.

فَإِنَّهُ لَا يَدْرِي أَيْنَ بَاتَتْ يَدَهُ

For he does not know where his hand was while he slept.

A note on that Hadīth, many 'Ulamā' inferred from the word bātat (بَاتَتْ), that it's only night sleep as opposed to day naps. Because (بَاتَتْ) generally refers to night sleep.

It most likely (والله أعلم) applies to both night and day sleep, but it's more common in night sleep because that's generally when one sleeps. However, it appears to apply to both night and day sleep.

And just to show you how detailed Fiqh is, how amazing and in depth it is, is the 'Ulamā' went to the extent of discussing if someone woke up from night sleep and wanted to make Wudū', that's a combination of the last two Masā'il that we took. He wants to make Wudū' and he woke up, washing your hands three times after waking up is Sunnah, and washing your hands for Wudū' three times is Sunnah as well. He's in a position where he has both in front of him. Does a person (therefore) wash his hands six times?

Some 'Ulamā' said this is an example of one 'Ibādah that gets included under the 'Adhr (عذر). And the hands should only be washed three times. They said if two 'Ibadāt (like this) of similar nature can be combined they should be, because the goal of each of them is the same – which is to clean. We know the reason for washing here is to cleanse oneself for 'Ibādah. And it's the same for both of those matters, so three times is sufficient.

Another group of 'Ulamā' said no, wash three times for waking up and three times for Wudū' which gives you a total of six times. They said each is an independent 'Ibādah, and each is intended on its own, so they're separate. Both are good and strong opinions, either one is good. However, it may be the opinion that says one gets intertwined with the other is a bit stronger.

The author then said,

وَالغَسْلَةُ الثَّانيةُ وَالثَّالثةُ.

We took the Sunnah of Tasmiyyah before Wudū'. And washing the hands before Wudū'. And washing the hands after waking up. Now he's saying repeating the washing of the limbs twice and thrice.

Notice this important order in detail, he mentioned washing the hands three times, after that he said, repeating washing of the limbs twice or thrice. Why? Because

his statement, repeating the washing twice or thrice applies to the rest of the Wudū' parts, it doesn't apply to the previous statement pertaining to washing the hands – that issue is done with. What he's mentioning now applies to the rest of the Wudū' parts. If you read it wrong in Arabic or misunderstand it, it could mislead one into thinking he means the hands are also included in that statement – and they're not. The Sunnah according to the author is washing the hands three times – that's done.

Then the statement pertains to the rest of the Wudū' parts, which means that it can be done once twice or three times. The Messenger (صلى الله عليه و سلم) made Wudū' one time as mentioned in Hadīth Ibn 'Abbās (رضي الله تعالى عنهم أجمعين), and he did Wudū' twice. He repeated washing the limbs twice as mentioned in Hadīth 'Abdullāh Ibn Zayd (رضي الله تعالى عنهم جميعاً). And there is the Hadīth of 'Uthmān Ibn 'Affān where he washed the Wudū' parts three times.

If the first wash encompasses the entire body parts supposed to be washed for Wudū' then that is sufficient. If not, the second wash would not be a Sunnah, rather a Wājib. Because that part must be fully wet with water as we already know.

وَالغَسْلَةُ الثَّانيةُ وَالثَّالثةُ.

The keyword here is also (الغسلة), washing. It's very essential in the author's book. What's mustahab in repeating washing the body parts of Wudū' is the ones that are washed. He said الغسلة. The face, the hands, and the feet. What's not washed, meaning, what's wiped – is mustahab to do it only once. The body parts that are wiped are like the head, ears, khuff and socks. That's the correct opinion, and it's contrary to Al-Madhhab Ash-Shāfi'ī that says all the limbs of Wudū' – whether washed or wiped – should be gone over all three times – even the ones that are wiped. That's according to some of the Shāfi'īyyah. They use general Ahādīth of making Wudū' that mention three times, and they included wiping in the three times – like the head. They also used other Ahādīth that include wiping over the head three times, which are very weak.

Like the one that states,

و مسح برأسه ثلاثه

That the messenger (صلى الله عليه و سلم) wiped his head three times. But that's very weak.

The correct opinion is that the head or body parts that are wiped are not included in going over them more than once. Now here's an issue, is it better to always wash the Wudū' body parts twice and three times? If you have time to do it three times is it better? The statement of the author appears broad in that it implies that it's always Sunnah to wash twice or thrice. Some said washing Wudū' parts is better than two, and two is better than one. They said because it covers more and there's Ahādīth pertaining to that. An-Nawawi, Ash-Shawkāni, Ibn Rushd, and others stated that washing three times is more complete and one is sufficient. That's if the water touches the entire part you're supposed to wash.

I believe the more correct opinion is to mix it up in this matter. Sometimes do Wudū' washing the body parts one time, sometimes twice, and sometimes thrice. And sometimes even within one Wudū' for one to do some body parts twice and some three times. That's the more accurate form of Sunnah (والله أعلم). That's called تنوع العبادة (mixing between 'Ibadāt). Because the complete Sunnah is to do all of that which the Messenger (صلى الله عليه و سلم) did. And he (صلى الله عليه و سلم) did one, twice, and thrice as narrated in the Ahādīth. So, it's best done precisely like him, mixing up between those forms, that's called تنوع العباده.

Like duā' Al-'Istifitāh, the duā' of the opening of the Salāh. There's many forms of 'Ad'iyah (supplications) for duā' Al-'Istifitāh. The Messenger (صلى الله عليه و سلم) stated many of them. And they were related to us. The best is to rotate, mix and change up between them. It's like the various forms of Tashahud that were related to us. Some ask, which one is the best one? The best is to mix and rotate between the various forms of 'Ibadāt, and likewise the same regarding this issue of doing it three times and sometimes twice.

What about going above three times in Wudū'? If the water encompasses what it should of the limbs, then it's Makrūh (disliked) to wash the body parts more than

three times. An-Nawawi and Ash-Shawkāni said 'Ulamā' said it's 'Ijmā' that it's disliked to wash over three times for Wudū' if the water touches that entire limb you're supposed to wash. Ibn Al-Mubārak said, whoever goes over three times in Wudū' is most likely going to get sinned, why? Because it's violating the Sunnah.

Imām Ahmad and Ishāq said, whoever goes over three times is afflicted,

لا يزيد على الثلاث إلا الرجل المبتلى

There's a supposed Hadīth that the 'Ulamā' mentioned something regarding it's narration, and it has some weakness in it. A Bedouin came to the Messenger (صلى الله عليه و سلم) and asked him about Wudū'. He (صلى الله عليه و سلم) showed him how to perform it, washing each part three times. Then he (صلى الله عليه و سلم) said this is Wudū', whoever does more than this has done evil, and transgressed in the limits, and wrong themself.

فمَن زاد على هذا؛ فقد أساءَ وتعدَّى وظلَمَ

'Ulamā' spoke about its authenticity, but the 'Ijmā' and general rules of following the 'Ibadāt precisely are more than sufficient, and that Hadīth isn't really need for that matter. The Messenger (صلى الله عليه و سلم) never went over three, and we follow the 'Ibadāt precisely in such matters. And also the general verse,

وَمَن يَتَعَدَّ حُدودَ اللَّهِ فَقَد ظَلَمَ نَفسَهُ

And whosoever transgresses the set limits of Allāh, then indeed he has wronged himself. 65:1

It somewhat falls under that verse. And that gives birth to the next Mas'alah.

If one does go over three times, is his Wudū' valid? Did that void his Wudū'? We mentioned that 'Ulamā' strongly deterred and hinted that he may get sinned for going over three – it's disliked. However, is his Wudū' accepted? Ad-Dārami (رحمه الله تعالى) said that some 'Ulamā' said, if he goes over three times his Wudū' is invalid because it's like

going over in Salāh, for example like someone making Dhuhur five rak'āt. Ibn Hajar and An-Nawawi respond and said it's disliked, yet it does not invalidate the Wudū'. They said this is different than Salāh, therefore they cannot be compared. That is the correct opinion, it's disliked – one should avoid it, but it does not void the Wudū'. We'll stop here, Jazākum Allāhu Khair,

و صلى الله على سيدنا محمد و على آله و صحبه و سلم